REMARKS

Claims 9-12 and 20 are presently pending. Claims 1-4 and 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5-8 and 16-19 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by MacInnis. Claim 9 recites, among other limitations, "an extractor for transmitting an indicator to a direct memory access engine indicating that the local buffer can store another portion of the video data, after the decompression engine decodes the portions of the video data stored in the local buffer." Claim 20 recites, among other limitations, "an extractor for transmitting a signal indicating that a portion of the local buffer is available to store another portion of the video data".

Examiner indicated in the previous office action that MacInnis teaches that "Bridge module 204 communicates with the local decoder memory 212 ad main memory 11, according to instructions from core processor 202 (column 6, lines 46-51). This corresponds with the claimed 'extractor'." Office Action, 7/24/2007, at 7.

Examiner also indicates that "Bridge module 204 communicates with the local decoder memory 212 and main memory 110, according to instructiosn from core processor 202 (column 6, lines 46-51). This corresponds with the claimed 'extractor'. The bridge module acts to fetch data from main memory 110 into a pipelined data processing system including local decoder memory 212 (column 6: lines 4-14) when a buffer memory is free (column 11: line 63-column 12: line 7). Then the fetch instruction corresponds with the claimed 'indicator'". Office Action, 3/17/08, at 6.

4

Assignee respectfully submits that even if the foregoing was correct, there is no teaching that the indicator, that Examiner asserts corresponds to the fetch instruction, is "indicating that the local buffer can store another portion of the video data". MacInnis, Col. 11, Lines 63+, merely state "In the sixth stage 750, buffer 0 (400) is free since the data it had been holding, the data for macroblock (0,0), was dispensed as output in stage five 740." Assignee respectfully submits that even in the foregoing context, a fetch instruction does not <u>indicate</u> "that the local buffer can store another portion of the video data". Additionally, the <u>fetch</u> instruction also does not indicate "that the local buffer can <u>store</u> another portion of the video data".

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 9-12, and 20, and requests that Examiner withdraw them.

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims is in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

Please charge any required fees not paid herewith or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

<div align="right">Respectfully submitted,</div>

June 17, 2008

Mirut Dalal
Registration No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX   (312) 775-8100